

Appl. No. 10/625,295

Amdt. Dated May 19, 2005

Reply to Office Action of April 05, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets (1 – 5) of drawings are formal drawings that replace the previously submitted informal drawings. No substantive changes have been made to the drawings. Applicants respectfully request that the replacement sheets be accepted.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets 1 – 5.

Best Available Copy

Remarks

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action of April 5, 2005. In the Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8, and 10. Claims 11-34 were allowed. Claims 7 and 9 were objected to, however, it was stated that claims 7 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form so as to include all base claim limitations and intervening claim limitations. The Applicants have amended the rejected claims to more clearly reflect an aspect of their invention. Independent claim 1 now reflects that the shaft guide element is a hollow shaft guide. For the reasons below, Applicants respectfully assert that amended claims 1-10 in their present form, should be allowed to issue.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 – 6, 8, and 10 UNDER 35 USC § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1 – 6, 8, and 10 under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by Hollcroft et al. (US Patent No. 3,521,661). Applicants have amended these claims to more clearly reflect an aspect of their invention. Specifically, the amended claim set now includes a *hollow* shaft guide as a limitation. Applicants submit this is not disclosed or taught in Hollcroft.

In particular, independent claim 1 now recites a hollow shaft guide as a claim limitation. Moreover, the hollow shaft guide is in fluid communication with the fluid inlet and the poppet chamber. Air admitted through the fluid inlet passes through the hollow shaft guide so as to pressurize/depressurize the poppet chamber. This pressurization/depressurization allows the poppet to open and close. It is submitted that this structure and functionality is not disclosed or suggested in Hollcroft. Rather, the valve in the cited reference uses other means to admit fluid pressure into a

Best Available Copy

Appl. No. 10/625,295

Amdt. Dated May 19, 2005

Reply to Office Action of April 05, 2005

chamber. Hollcroft does not disclose a structure whereby a hollow shaft guide, in which a moveable shaft is positioned, acts as the conduit for fluid pressure.

The Applicants acknowledge the comment that claims 7 and 9, if rewritten in independent form, would be allowable. However, at this time the Applicants seek the allowance of claims 7 and 9 as originally drafted as dependent on amended claim 1. Thus, Applicants have sought to amend claim 1 so as to be allowable.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIM 2 UNDER 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has further rejected dependent claim 2 as being unpatentable over Hollcroft in view of Greenland et al. (US Patent No. 3,655,134). Given the above-noted claim amendments, the applicants respectfully assert this rejection should be withdrawn. As noted above, independent claim 1 now includes the limitation that the shaft guide is hollow. The combination of Hollcroft and Greenland do not teach or suggest this limitation. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is allowable with respect to the above combination of references.

Best Available Copy

Conclusion

In view of the above arguments it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 1-6, 8 and 10 have been overcome and that the claims are in proper form for allowance. In view of the preceding remarks, it is urged respectfully that the rejection of the claims be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the presently submitted claims be allowed to issue.

If there are any fees associated with this Response, they may be charged to Deposit Account 50-2091. The PTO is authorized to charge any petition or extension fees to this account.

Respectfully submitted

Date: May 19, 2005

By



Ivan J. Mlachak
Reg. No. 42,008
(480) 385-5060

Best Available Copy